

20001021.qrp v01_n981.qrl.20001021

Date: Sat, 21 Oct 2000 19:03:08 EDT

From: qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU

To: "Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion" <qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU>

Subject: QRP-L digest 1981

QRP-L Digest 1981

Topics covered in this issue include:

- 1) [81688] coil turns spacer alternates
by "Stuart Rohre" <rohre@arlut.utexas.edu>
- 2) [81689] Pacificon is Under Way!!!!
by DYARNES@aol.com
- 3) [81690] kenwood repair
by M Goins <mgoins@usa.net>
- 4) [81691] URL for hensley paddle
by "Joe Trombino" <w2kj@earthlink.net>
- 5) [81692] RE: URL for hensley paddle
by "Mike D." <hrg@cifnet.com>
- 6) [81693] Vertical Antennas
by "James R. Duffey" <jamesd1@flash.net>
- 7) [81694] URL for Hensley paddle
by "Joe Trombino" <w2kj@earthlink.net>
- 8) [81695] Best P'con Badge of all
by Ed Loranger <we6w@qsl.net>
- 9) [81696] QRP Expedition to Outer Banks
by Paul Stroud <aa4xx@ipass.net>
- 10) [81697] Re: Vertical Antennas
by "George, W5YR" <w5yr@att.net>
- 11) [81698] Tuner
by "Dennis Johnson" <djohn@dwx.com>
- 12) [81699] Re: Vertical Antennas
by "Dan W. Dooley" <dandooley@pipeline.com>
- 13) [81700] Saint Pierre (FP) DXpedition ver 2
by Hank Kohl K8DD <k8dd@arrl.net>
- 14) [81701] FS: SW White Mountain 20 - SOLD
by Mark Sailer <msailer@buoy.com>
- 15) [81702] FS: NorCal 20 Kit
by Mark Sailer <msailer@buoy.com>
- 16) [81703] Epiphyte 3 construction report
by "Mike WA8BXN" <hubby2k@hotmail.com>
- 17) [81704] Re: Appalachian Trail VT and NH - Sunday 10/22
by "Ron Polityka" <wb3aal@fast.net>
- 18) [81705] Re: coil question
by Bill Stietenroth <k5zty@juno.com>
- 19) [81706] 1st QSO with New Boots

- by lenny wintfeld <w2bvh@home.com>
- 20) [81707] NC-20 for sale...and at Pacificon :)
by Mighty Mik <mightymik2@home.com>
- 21) [81708] Re: Vertical Antennas
by "Karl F. Larsen" <k5di@zianet.com>
- 22) [81709] Re: FT-817 QRP Rig...
by "Ken UK" <setiuk@talk21.com>
- 23) [81710] Re: coil question
by "Mike Yetsko" <myetsko@insydesw.com>
- 24) [81711] Re: Vertical Antennas
by John AE5X <ae5x@juno.com>
- 25) [81712] FS: MFJ 9406x 6m ssb/cw
by VE3JC - John C <jbcumming@wwdc.com>
- 26) [81713] For Sale Argo 556 with 6 band modules
by "Marty Purselley" <brewer@flash.net>
- 27) [81714] HW-9 station for sale
by "Marty Purselley" <brewer@flash.net>
- 28) [81715] Re: Vertical Antennas
by "James R. Duffey" <jamesd1@flash.net>
- 29) [81716] OT: Phoenix area QRP'ers
by "John Burnley" <burnleyia@home.com>
- 30) [81717] More on Coils
by "James R. Duffey" <jamesd1@flash.net>
- 31) [81718] Re: Vertical Antennas
by "James R. Duffey" <jamesd1@flash.net>
- 32) [81719] Re: Vertical Antennas
by "James R. Duffey" <jamesd1@flash.net>
- 33) [81720] re: ZOMBIE SHUFFLE INFO
by "Preston Buck" <pbuck@flash.net>
- 34) [81721] Coil winding
by George Murphy <VE3ERP@ENCODE.COM>
- 35) [81722] Vertical Antennas
by w2xn@juno.com
- 36) [81723] Re: Vertical Antennas
by Bruce Muscolino <w6toy@erols.com>
- 37) [81724] Re: OT: Phoenix area QRP'ers
by GElam30092@aol.com
- 38) [81725] More on the FT-817
by Duffer <hduff@ica.net>
- 39) [81726] Pacificon Photos/Swap/K1-ATU/FT-817
by ABCQRP <w6abc@yahoo.com>
- 40) [81727] Re: FT-817 QRP Rig...
by GElam30092@aol.com
- 41) [81728] Re: More on the FT-817
by "Paul Christensen" <paulc@mediaone.net>
- 42) [81729] Re: More on the FT-817
by "Mike Newbold" <newbold@cmn.net>
- 43) [81730] Re: More on the FT-817

by "Jeff Davis" <n9avg@indy.net>
44) [81731] Re: More on the FT-817
by Duffer <hduff@ica.net>
45) [81732] Re: More on the FT-817
by Bruce Muscolino <w6toy@erols.com>
46) [81733] FT817 vs K2
by NM5Mike@aol.com
47) [81734] new yaesu vs. K2
by M Goins <mgoins@usa.net>
48) [81735] Product Reviews
by George Murphy <VE3ERP@ENCODE.COM>
49) [81736] Re: More on the FT-817
by "George, W5YR" <w5yr@att.net>
50) [81737] Re: Vertical Antennas
by "George, W5YR" <w5yr@att.net>
51) [81738] Re: Vertical Antennas
by "George, W5YR" <w5yr@att.net>
52) [81739] Re: ZOMBIE SHUFFLE INFO
by "George, W5YR" <w5yr@att.net>
53) [81740] 20 & 15 were FB today
by n4qa@juno.com

Date: Fri, 20 Oct 2000 18:54:10 -0500
From: "Stuart Rohre" <rohre@arlut.utexas.edu>
To: <qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU>
Subject: [81688] coil turns spacer alternates
Message-ID: <010001c03af1\$0aba1330\$5ac07481@rohredt2000>

Gee,
Several replied, but no one mentioned small gauge fishing lines, which are thinner than average "string". There are also plastic threads and for wider turns spacing, weed whacker plastic.

How did you arrive at 6 tpi as the spacing you have to have? Seems you could deviate to 5 and add more turns.

72,
Stuart K5KVH

Date: Fri, 20 Oct 2000 20:06:15 EDT
From: DYARNES@aol.com
To: qrp-l@lehigh.edu
Subject: [81689] Pacificon is Under Way!!!!

Message-ID: <62.83c482b.272237f7@aol.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Hi Gang,

I got to San Jose last evening, and only 10 minutes late at that. Pretty amazing when you consider the mob of people I saw in the Phoenix airport just before I left. Radar problems in L.A. had really thrown a monkey wrench in many people's travel plans.

Jay, W5JAY, was there to meet me when I arrived in San Jose. We claimed my luggage and grabbed a bus for the rental car area. I got a car that was supposed to be in slot 546. It wasn't! 20 minutes later the Hertz people gave up looking for the mysterious missing car in slot 546 and gave me a mini-van (no other cars available I guess--same price). Then we made our way to the airport exit. Problem is, in San Jose the airport is just about the busiest place in town. It took forever for us to finally get to the freeway.

Jay navigated and I drove. We made it from 101 to 880 and finally to 680 which goes into Concord. It's 53 miles (plus or minus) from San Jose airport to Concord, in case anyone is interested. Not that much farther than it is from Oakland to Concord.

I was starved, so we grabbed a quick dinner at the Claim Jumper (just a couple of doors down from "Dots and Dashes"--no kidding, there really is a place called that--I'm going to get a group picture there and send it to QST for their foto page.

Finally made it to the hotel about 10 p.m.--No sooner had I gone through the door than I heard Doug Hendricks calling out a greeting--he was surrounded by several others, including Bill Jones, KD7S, who was showing another example of his incredible building skills. Man, that guy can really do it!

Chuck Adams, K7Q0 (who we thought was going to meet us in San Jose) came in about an hour later. He had been stranded for a while in L.A.

Jay hit the rack (he was coming from two time zones away) about that time, and I wasn't far behind.

Today several of us, including our visitors from England, (Graham and Tony, who also spend the day before with Doug and even taught his classes!), scrounged around some of the parts houses near San Jose and also picked up Dave Gauding at the Airport. George Heron got some badly needed connectors to complete his 80 meter PSK31 kit, and Jay got resupplied for his "Arkicon" Tick Keyer/Paddle kit. I think everyone found some goodies. Doug did the

hard negotiating for the larger acquisitions for Jay and George, all of which greatly benefits those of you who will be acquiring these kits. As Graham and Tony said, we have now all seen the "master" negotiator in action.

As I write this, the lobby is now jammed with later arrivals here at Pacificon. If you are reading this you probably aren't one of them, and you will be missed. Hopefully next year will be the year you get enough resolve to make the trip. It's a great get-together, and really worth the time and effort (and cost) to make the trip! Depending on how far away you are, it may not be too late to jump in the car and head this way.

Tonight we really get cranked up--a mob feed at Fuddruckers, the building contest, etc. Forums tomorrow and, for the early risers, a swapmeet right out our back door on the tarmac at the airport---yes you could have flown your plane here, parked it right outside your door practically. Lots of dealers here tomorrow too.

I better go take a nap to get ready!!!!

72 de Dave W7AQK

P.S. I got an email from Chip at Yaesu in answer to my query as to whether or not I might see the new FT-817 here. His answer was YES!!!! See, you shoulda been here!

D.

Date: 20 Oct 00 19:29:10 EST
From: M Goins <mgoins@usa.net>
To: QRP-L@LeHigh.edu
Subject: [81690] kenwood repair
Message-ID: <20001021002910.1758.qmail@aw164.netaddress.usa.net>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

The TS-120 I planned to use qrp/mobile is sick and I need to find someone= who works on kenwoods (or who is familiar with the 120) to discuss the proble= m with. Can anyone steer me to a good Kenwood tech? Thanks.

mike
wb5yjx

Get free email and a permanent address at <http://www.amexmail.com/?A=3D1>

Date: Fri, 20 Oct 2000 21:04:04 -0400
From: "Joe Trombino" <w2kj@earthlink.net>
To: <QRP-L@LEHIGH.EDU>
Subject: [81691] URL for hensley paddle
Message-ID: <004901c03afa\$d13c5140\$e652fc9e@earthlink.net>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Howdy gang:

A while back I had a URL for the Hensley paddle web page but, of course, I
some managed to lose it. Can anyone out there help me out??

Joe W2KJ (North
Carolina)

Date: Fri, 20 Oct 2000 20:09:21 -0500
From: "Mike D." <hrg@cifnet.com>
To: "Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion" <qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU>
Subject: [81692] RE: URL for hensley paddle
Message-ID: <002c01c03afb\$8b2a9580\$24ad4ec6@mike1>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Click the link in my signature file and scroll down for Hensley paddles.

73 de Mike, N9BOR
FISTS NR 4594 SOC # 116
<http://www.qsl.net/n9bor>

di dah dit - The only roger beep you'll ever need.
My designated driver is a 12BY7A.

> A while back I had a URL for the Hensley paddle web page but, of course, I
> some managed to lose it. Can anyone out there help me out??

>

>

> Carolina)

Joe W2KJ (North

Date: Fri, 20 Oct 2000 19:20:40 -0600
From: "James R. Duffey" <jamesd1@flash.net>
To: <qrp-1@lehigh.edu>
Subject: [81693] Vertical Antennas
Message-ID: <B6164B88.30D2%jamesd1@flash.net>
Mime-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

All - While I prefer horizontal antennas to verticals, I think that verticals got the sharp end of the stick in a recent post:

"If you want to play QRP games on the higher bands, get up a horizontal antenna as high as you can. And multi element horizontal antennas are even better. Check out the contest winners in QRP categories. Do they use verticals? For that matter, did the consistently successful FOXHUNTERS on 20m this summer use verticals? Nope. After one FOXHUNT try on 20m with the trap vertical at home, I decided there were better ways to spend my time."

If you want to see for yourself the efficacy of vertical antennas with QRP power levels on the HF bands, check the Northern California DX Foundation Beacons on 14.100, 18.110, 21.150, 24.930, and 28.200 MHz. These beacons have identical hardware; TS-50 transceivers to R-5 multi band verticals!

The beacons rotate through 18 locations around the world, allocating 10 seconds to each location. The power cycles during each 10 second broadcast from 100 W to 10 W to 1 W to 0.1 W. Thus you can hear the sounds of QRP signals through vertical antennas. Judge for yourself how they sound. Recall that the difference between the beacon's vertical and a dipole in its favored direction should be theoretically less than the 10 dB difference between power levels.

More information on the beacon network is available at:

<http://www.ncdxf.org/beacon.ht>

As to chasing the fox with verticals. After the initial onslaught is over, the Fox often calls CQ several times before receiving a reply. In my opinion, this summer on 20 M, any QRP station that could hear the fox could have worked the fox. He might not have been loudest in the pile up, but the loudest station in the pile up does not always work the fox first.

When I was the Fox on 40 M, Joe, AB7TT, put a competitive signal into my location with a 20 ft tall vertical on 40 M. Joe's signal was competitive with other hounds from the Phoenix area, Bob, Bertie, Brian, and Floyd.

While a vertical may not be the best antenna, operators using one should not despair from operating contests and fox hunts.

James R. Duffey KK6MC/5
30 Casa Loma Road
Cedar Crest, NM 87008

Date: Fri, 20 Oct 2000 21:21:17 -0400
From: "Joe Trombino" <w2kj@earthlink.net>
To: <QRP-L@LEHIGH.EDU>
Subject: [81694] URL for Hensley paddle
Message-ID: <01c301c03afd\$36a69e80\$e652fc9e@earthlink.net>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
 charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Many thanks to all who responded with the URL for the Hensley paddle.

73, Joe W2KJ

Date: Fri, 20 Oct 2000 18:24:18 -0700
From: Ed Loranger <we6w@qsl.net>
To: Low Power Amateru Radio Discussion <qrp-l@lehigh.edu>
Subject: [81695] Best P'con Badge of all
Message-ID: <39F0F042.984CDA8D@qsl.net>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Hi gang, just got all packed up for Pacificon.

The kids hit the floor laughing when the saw
all my chest medals :-)

I got the WE6W nametag, NORCAL, Zombie, Pacificon,
and Zombie pin from 1999.

Best of all, I chained up the switch spacing tools from all 4 of the K2's I built. Best badge of all.

I'm the guy with the green PC Board strips on his chest :-)

And always smiling.

72/Smilin' Ed, we6w

--

72/Ed WE6W; A-1 Op; SOC#63; QRPL#1068
<http://www.qsl.net/we6w> Santa Rosa, CA
My 2 pennies worth is just common cents.

Why pay for something you could get for free?
NetZero provides FREE Internet Access and Email
<http://www.netzero.net/download/index.html>

Date: Fri, 20 Oct 2000 21:34:01 -0400
From: Paul Stroud <aa4xx@ipass.net>
To: klqrp <Klqrp@applegate.org>
Cc: nogaqrp@qth.net, QRP-L <QRP-L@lehigh.edu>
Subject: [81696] QRP Expedition to Outer Banks
Message-ID: <39F0F289.23DE8CD1@ipass.net>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Hi Gang,

Below is a URL which includes an aerial photograph of the site I'll be operating from this coming Sunday. I Hope to hear you on 80/160M.

72, Paul AA4XX IOTA NA67 nr. Portsmouth Island, NC

<http://www.ipass.net/~aa4xx/newdrum.htm>

Date: Fri, 20 Oct 2000 20:31:36 -0500
From: "George, W5YR" <w5yr@att.net>
To: jamesd1@flash.net
Cc: Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion <qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU>
Subject: [81697] Re: Vertical Antennas

Message-ID: <39F0F1F8.DEFE239@att.net>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Jim, I have to agree about the success of verticals in the Fox Hunts.

This summer, I managed to get 16 out of the 20 Foxes - all that I could hear - and about half those contacts were with the Butternut HF9V and the other half with the 20-meter EDZ wire antenna.

The only rule about antennas is that there is no general rule. I have three wire antennas and the vertical here and have about worn out the coax switch moving among them as conditions change.

72/73, George W5YR - the Yellow Rose of Texas NETXQRP 6

Fairview, TX 30 mi NE Dallas in Collin county QRP-L 1373
Amateur Radio W5YR, in the 55th year and it just keeps getting better!
Icom IC-756 PRO #02121 (9/00) Kachina #91900556 (12/99) IC-765 (6/90)

"James R. Duffey" wrote:

>

> All - While I prefer horizontal antennas to verticals, I think that
> verticals got the sharp end of the stick in a recent post:

Date: Fri, 20 Oct 2000 20:35:25 -0500
From: "Dennis Johnson" <djohn@dwx.com>
To: "qrp-l" <qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU>
Subject: [81698] Tuner
Message-ID: <001f01c03aff\$30f4e080\$a9c6cecf@dennisjohnson>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

What a great group!! Thanks for all the quick (and knowledgeable) replies to my question about the MFJ-971. Will add one to the shack here.

72/73 -- Dennis, N0WA

Date: Fri, 20 Oct 2000 20:59:15 -0500

From: "Dan W. Dooley" <dandooley@pipeline.com>
To: <jamesd1@flash.net>, "Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion" <qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU>
Subject: [81699] Re: Vertical Antennas
Message-ID: <010301c03b02\$873143a0\$0400a8c0@bergenbrunswick.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

I don't despair at all. I get by quite fine with my elevated vertical. Haven't operated any contests or fox hunts, but have broken some DX pileups and always seem to get real good signal reports running 1 to 3 watts. Domestic and otherwise. 'Course my antenna is not a "trap" vertical either.

Bottom line is, I would put up a horizontal multiband antenna if I could get it up over about 25 ft. Can't. No supports high enough. But, the vertical mounted on a mast of about 18 ft, puts it up reasonably high. Just a tall, thin, shiny shaft sticking up amongst the trees. Not highly noticeable from outside the yard. And, at these heights, I think the vertical will do better.

We do what we have to do to get the job done. So which is the best real solution? Whatever gets the most RF out towards the horizon.

Dan W. Dooley WB5TKA Bedford, Texas EM12ku
e-mail to: dandooley@pipeline.com
SOC #198, FPQRP # -104
May Goddes love blest ye alle
"Ancient Pistol, I do partly understand your meaning."

----- Original Message -----

From: "James R. Duffey" <jamesd1@flash.net>
To: "Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion" <qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU>
Sent: Friday, October 20, 2000 8:20 PM
Subject: Vertical Antennas

>
> While a vertical may not be the best antenna, operators using one should not
> despair from operating contests and fox hunts.

Date: Fri, 20 Oct 2000 22:16:06 -0400
From: Hank Kohl K8DD <k8dd@arrl.net>
To: qrp-l@lehigh.edu, SOC <soc@qth.net>, secondclassopsclub@egroups.com
Subject: [81700] Saint Pierre (FP) DXpedition ver 2
Message-ID: <4.3.2.7.2.20001020220514.00bde7c0@mail.tir.com>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

FP DXpedition to Saint Pierre Island

Equipment is packed. We're pumped!
Fly out of Toronto Monday morning.
Arrive St. Pierre in the afternoon.

I'll be looking for QRP contacts around, or below 7040:
(Eastern Time zone) October 26 from about 8 PM till 10 PM
(UTC) October 27 from about 0000 till 0200
I'll try to keep it on one frequency - not much RIT and
no split.

The radio will be 5 watts.
The antenna will be a dipole or a vertical.
The weather will be cold, wet and foggy.
The track will be slow.

Any comments or questions or schedule requests direct as I
only read the archive sporadically!

73 Hank K8DD

Date: Fri, 20 Oct 2000 22:25:26 -0400
From: Mark Sailer <msailer@buoy.com>
To: qrp-l <qrp-l@lehigh.edu>
Subject: [81701] FS: SW White Mountain 20 - SOLD
Message-ID: <39F0FE96.CAA86415@buoy.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Thanks to all those who replied.
It has been sold and going to a new owner.

Mark

Date: Fri, 20 Oct 2000 22:46:03 -0400
From: Mark Sailer <msailer@buoy.com>
To: qrp-l <qrp-l@lehigh.edu>
Subject: [81702] FS: NorCal 20 Kit
Message-ID: <39F1036B.A95F209B@buoy.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Found my NorCal 20 kit.
Work and Family are taking all my time.
Partially started, 10 turn POT installed.
With all parts, case and manuals.

\$113 shipped US Priority Mail
PayPal accepted for payment -

Email me off the list if interested
Mark

Date: Sat, 21 Oct 2000 03:13:47 GMT
From: "Mike WA8BXN" <hubby2k@hotmail.com>
To: qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU
Subject: [81703] Epiphyte 3 construction report
Message-ID: <LAW2-F15kyPzGNSokLQ000089bf@hotmail.com>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; format=flowed

Page 3 - Install the current sensor T3 ----- the assembly instructions say to use a 470 ohm resistor for R24 but all other indications (parts list, schematic) it should be 330 ohms, and the 470 ohm resistor is needed for R15.

Page 4 - Install trimmer cap C56 ----- mine did not fit the holes, so i scraped the solder mask off the component side of the board, and bent the two tabs that didn't fit the holes and soldered them on the component side.

Other notes... the semiconductors (transistors, diodes, ICs) are not listed in the parts list but are reasonably well identified in the construction text. D6 is the big 1N4005 one.

C63 is polarized but + side not indicated on schematic or board. Its pretty obvious the - side is grounded, and + should be toward the center of the board.

The parts list indicates 6 470 pF capacitors, which are included in the kit but only 5 are used. There will be one extra one when you are done.

You will need a 4.7 K resistor which is not provided, but indicated in the instructions, to put in series with the 10 turn tuning pot.

My kit of parts was missing all the IC sockets, but I had some in my junk box from Radio Shack, so that did not delay construction.

Page 6 ----- Testing and alignment

I could not tune X1 to 452.6 KHz within the range of the trimmer cap C56. I added a 33 pF NP0 capacitor on the component side in parallel with C56 and was able to then get it right on frequency. Also, in setting L6 you may want to use a higher frequency than 4.2 MHz (maybe 4.3 MHz) so the upper end of the tuning range will be closer to 4 MHz. After alignment I tuned the 10 turn pot to maximum clockwise (highest frequency) and then tuned L6 to give an operating frequency of 4 MHz. This allows tuning to the 75 M qrp frequency of 3.985.

I have been quite pleased with the performance of the radio so far. On my to do list is determine how to use a stock Radio Shack speaker/mic with the radio (instructions note an additional transistor will be needed for the switching), packaging in a real box, and a frequency readout - provision is made for one and the Small Wonder Labs Freq-mite that I already have looks like it will work. I think I will also mount the two LEDs (for power out and AGC, a sort of S meter) on the front panel.

73 - Mike WA8BXN

Get Your Private, Free E-mail from MSN Hotmail at <http://www.hotmail.com>.

Share information about yourself, create your own public profile at
<http://profiles.msn.com>.

Date: Fri, 20 Oct 2000 23:29:04 -0400
From: "Ron Polityka" <wb3aal@fast.net>
To: ". QRP-L" <qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU>, ". NJ QRP-L" <njqrp@njqrp.org>
Subject: [81704] Re: Appalachian Trail VT and NH - Sunday 10/22
Message-ID: <008601c03b0f\$12db8b20\$e55578cc@wb3aal>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Just remember.

You have to make a QSO with them outside the
ARCI QSO Party. You can't count them for the
AT Awards if you make a contest QSO with them.
Sorry! Check the AT Award rules at www.n3epa.org .

72 Ron de N3EPA

----- Original Message -----

From: "Brian B. Riley, N1BQ" <n1bq@wulfdn.org>
To: "Appalachian Trail Award" <atrail-1@Lehigh.EDU>
Sent: Thursday, October 19, 2000 7:58 PM
Subject: Appalachian Trail VT and NH - Sunday 10/22

> KM1Z and I, N1BQ, will be down in East Central Vermont operating from
> the Appalachian Trail on the VT-NH border operating 7040 +/- QRM and
> possibly 15m (frequency to be determined). We plan to be operating
> under our club callsign, W1M00. We are an 'alternative' club formed a
> while back when the two big clubs in the area were feuding. We call
> ourselves "The Udder Club," which goes quite nicely with our callsign. I
> am taking my digital camera along and we plan to make up a card just for
> the day.

>

> We plan to get to the area and start setting up to be able to be on the
> air at 1000r/1400z. If we can set up at our primary choice site we will
> stay there the whole time. If that site doesn't pan out (maybe something
> going on at the canoe club) we will move back up into the hills behind
> Norwich and operate VT for two hours then pack up and go across the
> river through Hanover and up into the hills on the NH side. We are
> taking some TT2s along and may put them on the air depending on how busy
> things get.

>

> So in summary we will be on either plan A or plan B

>

> Plan A - NH-VT border 1400z to about 1900z

> Plan B - VT side 1400z to 1600Z, the NH side from 1700Z-1900Z

>

> When you hear us on the air KM1Z will be the whiz kid and N1BQ will be
> the one that sounds like he needs to QLF!

>

> 72 de brian, n1bq

>

> --

> N1BQ-3 @ 44 31.73N 072 51.55W

> WideN-N digi and weather station in Underhill Center, VT

> mailto:n1bq@wulfden.org
> AMSAT LM-1418 NJQRP #274 QRP-L #2276
>
>
>

Date: Fri, 20 Oct 2000 22:56:36 -0500
From: Bill Stietenroth <k5zty@juno.com>
To: Drbob92031@aol.com, qrp-l@lehigh.edu
Subject: [81705] Re: coil question
Message-ID: <20001020.225646.-3892851.1.k5zty@juno.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Bob,

I don't know what you are using for a coil form but, I can turn a groove in a piece of 2" schedule 40 PVC on a lathe for you if that will work. It might cost you a couple of bucks for postage.

Bill, K5ZTY
Houston, TX

Date: Sat, 21 Oct 2000 01:01:52 +0930
From: lenny wintfeld <w2bvh@home.com>
To: njqrp club <njqrp@njqrp.org>
Cc: Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion <qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU>
Subject: [81706] 1st QSO with New Boots
Message-ID: <39F06568.3AAC72A1@home.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Hi!

Just had my first qso using a HB power amp I designed (using info from VE3DNL's web site, the free version of MicroSIM, and with encouragement from Joe E. N2CX).

The amp is connected to the K7QO's 20 mW "SNAP" transmitter kit which was distributed to attendees prior to last Atlanticon.

It puts out 1.5 watts and is about 92% efficient.

I had to change crystals in the SNAP. 3.579 MHz seems to always have some low level carrier (or is it digital modulation?) and no takers for a CQ. For the cost of a \$ 0.45 microprocessor crystal, I went to 3.686 MHz and was able to easily raise WG1H/m. The brief qso was from Cranford NJ to Chicopee MA. Al gave me a sig report of 589 without knowing I was using a 2 transistor transmitter capable of full output (for a while at least) with a 9 volt transistor radio battery.

Well with that success behind me, I guess I'm all set to design up a multiband spread spectrum transceiver.

All kidding aside, family obligations permitting, I'm going to give it a try in the ARCI contest tomorrow and see what happens.

73,

Lenny W2BVH

Date: Fri, 20 Oct 2000 23:53:58 -0700
From: Mighty Mik <mightymik2@home.com>
To: "Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion" <qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU>
Subject: [81707] NC-20 for sale...and at Pacificon :)
Message-ID: <5.0.0.25.0.20001020234838.02072e20@24.0.0.70>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

Club Kit with:
Anodized black case
10 turn pot
AGC mod
and a TICK-4 keyer.

note: VFO range is 14.002 to 14.196, and can be changed by one cap. All docs included. asking \$150, and if not sold at Pacificon, will be offered to interested parties.

de WD8MNV

Date: Sat, 21 Oct 2000 05:48:28 -0600 (MDT)
From: "Karl F. Larsen" <k5di@zianet.com>
To: "James R. Duffey" <jamesd1@flash.net>

Cc: Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion <qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU>
Subject: [81708] Re: Vertical Antennas
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.10.10010210522030.793-1000000@cannac.ampr.org>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

I ran the Summer Hunt with a TH6DXX beam 55 feet in the air. Nice low angle of radiation and I can rotate it in the right direction. 20 meters is a band I can work.

40 meters is another bag of worms. The TH6DXX don't work there. I have a nice inverted vee for 80 meters that works poor on all bands. Radiation goes straight up and I'm loud 250 miles away.

To get 1500 miles I need an antenna with low angle of radiation on 40 meters. Either put a dipole up 66 feet or make a vertical work. The dipole was physically impossible so I found a Butternut vertical locally for sale and bought it.

It's 32 feet high, almost a 1/4 wave on 40 meters. Went through a dance figuring out how many radials to use and since it's elevated it took 4 tuned radials to work on 40 only.

Tested it on receive of w1aw on the east coast. They start coming in at dark in NM and I can switch between my wire and the vertical. To my agony the wire seemed to work better! But after some analysis it became clear the signal-to-noise was better on the wire, but the signal pushed the s-meter higher on the vertical. Noise is vertically polarized and my vertical picks it up fine. Had I been working w1aw he would like the vertical signal much more than the wire.

Then heard Doc K0EVZ sign off with a guy and called him. He was only running 2 watts and propagation was not good but I copied him ok when QSB peaked. Doc had less trouble with me but I was running 5 watts to the vertical. I switched to the wire and could not even hear Doc on that. The vertical was the best antenna for that QSO. We are about 800-1000 miles apart...

Bottom line: K5DI is going to have more fun on the QRP-L Winter Fox Hunts. Hope to beat you in the pile up!

On Fri, 20 Oct 2000, James R. Duffey wrote:

snip

> location with a 20 ft tall vertical on 40 M. Joe's signal was competitive
> with other hounds from the Phoenix area, Bob, Bertie, Brian, and Floyd.
>
> While a vertical may not be the best antenna, operators using one should not
> despair from operating contests and fox hunts.
> James R. Duffey KK6MC/5
> 30 Casa Loma Road
> Cedar Crest, NM 87008
>
>
>

Yours Truly,

- Karl F. Larsen, k5di@arrl.net (505) 524-3303 -

Date: Sat, 21 Oct 2000 12:15:53 +0100
From: "Ken UK" <setiuk@talk21.com>
To: <hduff@ica.net>, "Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion" <qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU>
Subject: [81709] Re: FT-817 QRP Rig...
Message-ID: <00aa01c03b56\$29d7ab00\$f0b7073e@KenUK>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

HI Hugh,

Thanks very much for your comments, they are really appreciated (see my
direct reply).

Best regards, Ken, G4KIR.

-----Original Message-----

From: Ham <hduff@ica.net>
To: Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion <qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU>
Date: Friday, October 20, 2000 4:07 PM
Subject: Re: FT-817 QRP Rig...

>Hi Ken.

>No missed point. I understand the pride and joy of building and operating a
>kit that you put together plus the comfort in knowing that you are likely
>to
>be able to troubleshoot it should something go wrong (if you actually built
>it). However, I can get as much of that feeling by building a monoband

Small

>Wonder Labs kit for \$100.

>

>I 'read the mail' from this list almost daily and much of what I read is
>opinions...so here's mine...

>

>There seems to be this false pretention of calling ones self a 'homebrewer'
>as kit builders in the QRP cliché. Sort of reminds me of the days when I
put

>my first Apple clone computer together...everyone figured I was a
>genious...not only was I into computers but I built it ! A good ego
booster

>but the truth of the matter was that it was nothing more than *assembly*
>work. Following the instructions and assembling a prepackaged kit is no
>great technical feat to me. Whoever designed the kit is the true
homebrewer,

>those of which are few and far between in Ham radio today. I don't
personally

>get much of a warm and fuzzy "Heart and Soul" feeling when I throw a kit
>together. Not to knock kit builders...at least it's a step closer to the
>roots of Ham radio than appliance operating. I don't claim to be an
>accomplished 'homebrewer' although I have designed some of my own
equipment,

>I still enjoy building kits. The offerings of kit designers is appreciated.

>

>I get a chuckle out of those who have been fooled into thinking that the K2
>is "right up there" in receiver performance with their FT-1000. C'mon
there's

>no comparison. Granted, it's a good performer and I understand how it would
>appeal to a QRPer who has been used to operating small and simple monoband
>QRP rigs. "American made!" "All band with digital tuning !" I can see
the
>appeal.

>However, when you're finished with the options game, and if your time to
>build it is worth anything to you, all of a sudden there's a large variety
of

>competition in the field. Even if you preclude the assembly time, there
are

>other pre-made radios with yet much more frequency coverage and features in
>the same price class. Sometimes economy and common sense surpass the "Heart
>and Soul" feeling of having assembled a kit.

>There's further humour in the fact that quite a number of K2 owners had
their

>kit assembled and tested by "for-hire" builders. So much for the warmth and
>fuzziness of putting your "Heart and Soul" into it.

>I do think EleCraft did a great job of marketing the K2...they sure stirred
>up all kinds of interest here on the qrp-l server.

>To paraphrase Chuck AA8VS,"Tell 'em SUVs are all the rage and they

will
>come" :)
>
>The point of my original comment, Ken, has more to do with the observation
of
>great reluctance to a 'new kid on the block'. I'm still seeing anti-FT-817
>messages popping up here as if it was acceptable for the K2 to exist as a
>high priced QRP rig because it's a kit, but not the ready to rock FT-817.
As
>far as I can tell, there's room for both and more to come with QRP as the
>fastest growing facet of the hobby.
>
>Nonetheless, "QRP rig" is synonomous with "simple monoband rig" to me. If I
>want to play QRP, I'll hook up one of my monoband kit or homebrewed rigs.
If
>I'm looking for high performance, multiband operation, I'll fire up one of
my
>'Big rigs'.
>Everyone has their 'thang'.....to each his own !
>Just my take on how I see it.
>
>Hugh VA3TO
>
>
>Ken UK wrote:
>
>> HI Hugh,
>>
>> I think you may have missed the point regards the K2.
>>
>> The K2 is a home-brew rig (OK a kit rig) so that means a part of your
>> heart and sole went into its construction, I don't think you can say that
>> about any commercially built piece of equipment.
>>
>> Good luck and all the best, Ken, G4KIR.

Date: Sat, 21 Oct 2000 08:28:21 -0400
From: "Mike Yetsko" <myetsko@insydesw.com>
To: <k5zty@juno.com>, "Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion" <qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU>
Subject: [81710] Re: coil question
Message-ID: <004801c03b5a\$6932b480\$0600a8c0@dad>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

You know, I never thought of that!! But this is a REALLY neat idea! Laying down a 'guide groove' to wind a coil on!!

The only down side I can see is if it were a base coil in an antenna 'structure' this could weaken the PVC some. In addition, if you have a 'tap' on the coil, you're probably going to want to put a 'flat spot' on the side of the form as well so you can allow an aligator clip to actually grab the wire. The combination of the two cuts, spiral around and the flat verticle, might lower it's rigidity too much...

Unless you built your coil as a form with no mechanical (to the overall antenna) rigidity but putting one piece of PVC inside the other and the antenna rigidity depends on the internal piece only. Or if it was one of those cases where you could get a smaller size that 'telescopes' into your form piece, just glue it up and slip it in.

Mike

> I don't know what you are using for a coil form but, I can turn
> a groove in a piece of 2" schedule 40 PVC on a lathe for you
> if that will work.
>
> Bill, K5ZTY
> Houston,TX

Date: Sat, 21 Oct 2000 09:01:04 -0400
From: John AE5X <ae5x@juno.com>
To: qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU
Subject: [81711] Re: Vertical Antennas
Message-ID: <20001021.090105.4902.0.ae5x@juno.com>

I'm was disappointed with the results from an 80-meter wire vertical that I recently put up in the backyard. Not having the height for an 80-meter dipole at 1/2 wavelength, I thought a vertical would be the DX antenna-of-choice. Four hours and \$50 later, the antenna is complete - a 66' wire hanging from a 67' oak branch and coming down to 4 quarter-wave radials. SWR is flat from 3500-3535. Perfect - I thought.

Nightfall comes and I'm hearing stations 200-400 miles away who are working European DX. I can't hear a thing from across the pond. The

1-landers up the road are coming in great and they're giving 569 reports to the G, DL and OK stations - who are not even a whisper here! I can't even tell they're there. I switch over to my 40m dipole (up 60 feet) and now the US stations are 2 S-units stronger but still no hint of a signal from the DX. I start to wonder if these folks are working split, but they aren't. I then talk to a station in Newfoundland who patiently lets me switch antennas for a comparison report. He says I'm stronger on the 40m dipole than the full size 80m vertical - and this is on 80m! On top of all that, the vertical (no surprise) is noisier than the dipole.

So now I'm trying to figure which trees to use to hang an 80m dipole that won't interfere with my 40m dipole. It ain't going to be easy. Anyone want to come over? I'll feed you.....!

John Harper AE5X/2
HW-9, OHR-100A/20, NC40A, SST30, SST40, DSW20
Outdoor QRP: <http://home.att.net/~j..harper>

On Sat, 21 Oct 2000 05:48:28 -0600 (MDT) "Karl F. Larsen"
<k5di@zianet.com> writes:
>

> Tested it on receive of w1aw on the east coast. They start
>coming
>in at dark in NM and I can switch between my wire and the vertical. To
>my
>agony the wire seemed to work better! But after some analysis it
>became
>clear the signal-to-noise was better on the wire, but the signal
>pushed
>the s-meter higher on the vertical. Noise is vertically polarized and
>my
>vertical picks it up fine. Had I been working w1aw he would like the
>vertical signal much more than the wire.

YOU'RE PAYING TOO MUCH FOR THE INTERNET!
Juno now offers FREE Internet Access!
Try it today - there's no risk! For your FREE software, visit:
<http://dl.www.juno.com/get/tagj>.

Date: Sat, 21 Oct 2000 09:08:54 -0400
From: VE3JC - John C <jbcumming@wwdc.com>
To: Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion <qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU>
Subject: [81712] FS: MFJ 9406x 6m ssb/cw

Message-ID: <39F19566.BFBC35AE@wwdc.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

This rig is in excellent condition, and has been used very little, since I don't seem to find much time to get on 6 m.

For specifications, see:

<http://www.mfjenterprises.com/transceivers/mfj9406.html>

Included are the MFJ mic and the optional cw adapter.

Asking \$US 215, which includes insured shipping within North America.

		VE3JC John Cumming
Q		Delaware, ON CANADA
/\		jbcumming@wwdc.com
@` /<-----		hf qrp cw bicycle mobile
(*) \(*)		http://www.geocities.com/ve3jc/

Date: Sat, 21 Oct 2000 08:57:52 -0500
From: "Marty Purselley" <brewer@flash.net>
To: "Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion" <qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU>
Subject: [81713] For Sale Argo 556 with 6 band modules
Message-ID: <00a201c03b66\$e8510260\$46bafea9@mlp>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Ten Tec Argonaut 556 with 6 band modules (80, 40, 20, 17, 15, 10) includes built in keyer and noise blanker. Rig is in excellent condition. \$450.00.

Thanks,

Marty AA5UN

Date: Sat, 21 Oct 2000 09:08:13 -0500
From: "Marty Purselley" <brewer@flash.net>

To: "Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion" <qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU>
Subject: [81714] HW-9 station for sale
Message-ID: <00b601c03b68\$5abf54e0\$46bafea9@mlp>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Heathkit HW-9, PSA-9 power supply, and HM-9 qrp watt meter. Selling as a package only. I do not have the manuals for any of this gear.
\$325.00 .

Marty AA5UN

Date: Sat, 21 Oct 2000 08:23:06 -0600
From: "James R. Duffey" <jamesd1@flash.net>
To: "Karl F. Larsen" <k5di@zianet.com>
Cc: Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion <qrp-l@lehigh.edu>
Subject: [81715] Re: Vertical Antennas
Message-ID: <B61702E9.30ED%jamesd1@flash.net>
Mime-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Karl - Thanks for your note regarding your experience with the vertical on 40 M.

I had followed the radial discussion on QRP-L. Glad to hear that your Butternut now works FB.

If the vertical is noisy, you may have some currents flowing on the outside of the feed line. This will pick up noise from surrounding sources. To prevent these currents from flowing, install a choke balun at the vertical feed point. An air wound coax balun should do fine. Use the instructions in the Handbook/Antenna Book, or go to the following URL:

<http://www.berkshire.net/~robbins/technote/airbalun.html>

You might want to look in to feeding your 55 ft tower and TH6 as a top loaded vertical using a gamma/omega match. The details are in most handbooks. This would get the high current point up away from ground.

I will look for you when I am the FOX. You will probably want to use the horizontal wire. - Duffey KK6MC/5

--

James R. Duffey KK6MC/5
30 Casa Loma Road
Cedar Crest, NM 87008

Date: Sat, 21 Oct 2000 09:34:13 -0500
From: "John Burnley" <burnleyia@home.com>
To: <qrp-l@lehigh.edu>
Subject: [81716] OT: Phoenix area QRP'ers
Message-ID: <000301c03b6b\$fbb8b6e0\$1b790818@c149552-a.west1.ia.home.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

My trip to your area is on and I hope to be able to meet
some of you during my stay. I'll arrive on Saturday
October 28 at 7:00 am (groan) and have to leave
Thursday November 3. Can any of you recommend
some good spots to pick up parts (i.e.. 4Mhz xtals,
10.7 Mhz IF cans, etc.) or any other QRP/ham/electronics
places of interest? Thanks much in advance!

72, John NU0V

Date: Sat, 21 Oct 2000 08:46:03 -0600
From: "James R. Duffey" <jamesd1@flash.net>
To: <qrp-l@lehigh.edu>
Subject: [81717] More on Coils
Message-ID: <B617084B.30EF%jamesd1@flash.net>
Mime-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

I am always surprised by what generates a lot of interest on the list, and
the recent thread on coils certainly was a surprise. Here is my two cents
worth.

As a general rule of thumb, coils having square construction, that is the
diameter of the coil equal to its length, and the spacing between turns
equal to the wire diameter will perform very well. There can be fairly large

deviations from these dimensions without significant deterioration in performance.

Winding the wire with a spacer such as nylon monofilament used in fishing line and "Weed Whackers" will help preserve uniform spacing. You can leave the monofilament in place or remove it.

I wouldn't worry about 5 turns per inch as opposed to 6 turns per inch. Just make the coil longer to get the additional inductance. The handbook has all the appropriate formulas.

With a coil that will have a variety of tap positions, the square requirement is of course impossible to meet.

You might want to look into construction of the St.Louis Coil as recently published in QRPp. It was designed to load a 20 ft vertical based on the SD-10 to 40 M.

I hope that this helps. - Dr. Megacycle KK6MC/5

--

James R. Duffey KK6MC/5
30 Casa Loma Road
Cedar Crest, NM 87008

Date: Sat, 21 Oct 2000 08:53:12 -0600
From: "James R. Duffey" <jamesd1@flash.net>
To: "George, W5YR" <w5yr@att.net>
Cc: Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion <qrp-l@lehigh.edu>
Subject: [81718] Re: Vertical Antennas
Message-ID: <B61709F8.30F2%jamesd1@flash.net>
Mime-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

George - Having two different antennas available is a distinct advantage:

"This summer, I managed to get 16 out of the 20 Foxes - all that I could hear - and about half those contacts were with the Butternut HF9V and the other half with the 20-meter EDZ wire antenna."

Particualrly when they are as dieverse as your EDZ and vertical.

Several "Single Operator 2 Radio" testers use a multiband vertical as the

antenna for the second radio.

See you when it is my turn as FOX. - Dr. Megacycle KK6MC/5

--

James R. Duffey KK6MC/5
30 Casa Loma Road
Cedar Crest, NM 87008

Date: Sat, 21 Oct 2000 08:59:44 -0600
From: "James R. Duffey" <jamesd1@flash.net>
To: "Dan W. Dooley" <dandooley@pipeline.com>, Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion
<qrp-1@lehigh.edu>
Subject: [81719] Re: Vertical Antennas
Message-ID: <B6170B80.30F3%jamesd1@flash.net>
Mime-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Dan - Thanks for the note. If your vertical is for 30 M, then you have it in
a good position for 20 M, as the horizontal antenna's advantage over the
vertical really improves for heights above half wavelength.

If you want to experiment with horizonatal antennas, but only have a single
support, don't forget the inverted vee.- Dr. Megacycle KK6MC/5

--

James R. Duffey KK6MC/5
30 Casa Loma Road
Cedar Crest, NM 87008

Date: Sat, 21 Oct 2000 10:33:49 -0500
From: "Preston Buck" <pbuck@flash.net>
To: "qrp-1" <qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU>
Subject: [81720] re: ZOMBIE SHUFFLE INFO
Message-ID: <001001c03b74\$51d2f9c0\$db31ed1@pbuck.infoblvd.net>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Okay, I am dying of curiosity and can't resist.

What is the plural of Elvis?

Elveese, Elviii, Elvises, all y'all Elvis.

It isn't in my dictionary and spell-check if of no use.

73

Preston, n0g1m, Ellis County, TX

Paul NA5N wrote:

I'll post a list shortly of who the 25 Grand Zombies are. The Elvis', however, remain TOP SECRET until after the shuffle

.

Date: Sat, 21 Oct 2000 12:01:53 -0400
From: George Murphy <VE3ERP@ENCODE.COM>
To: qrp-l@lehigh.edu
Subject: [81721] Coil winding
Message-ID: <4.3.2.7.0.20001021112532.00a91730@ENCODE.COM>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

Here is an emergency method (definition of "emergency method" - do it any way you can and hope it lasts forever!) for winding coils:

1. Find something around the house the right diameter to use as a mandrel on which to wind the coil - any rigid tubular object will do - wood, metal, plastic - it doesn't matter what.
2. Wrap the mandrel with a couple of layers of waxed paper, and secure with thin sticky tape (this is one of the few jobs where duct tape is not appropriate).
3. Wind the coil on the mandrel with bare wire, using a scrap length of the same wire as a spacer between turns (any spacing much more or less than the diameter of the wire will result in serious loss of Q - but that is another

matter for discussion!).

4. Place 3 or 4 wooden lollipop sticks a bit longer than the coil equally spaced around the coil and hold in place with a couple of elastic bands. These will hold the turns and allow you to neaten up the spacing if required.

5. Run a continuous bead of hot-melt glue (or better still, one of those magic adhesives that require surgery when you accidentally glue your fingers together) along each lollipop stick, allowing the glue to slop over a little onto the wire turns.

6. When the glue has set, slip the whole works, wax paper and all, off the mandrel and return the mandrel to wherever your XYL/OM had it, before she/he discovers it is missing.

7. Cut away the waxed paper from the coil and you are done. If you need a coil form in place for structural reasons, use plastic pipe or rigid tubing/rod for the mandrel, and slip it back into the coil and secure with a dab or two of stickum.

8. The only problem I have had with this method is when I wind several coils at a time. I get awful sick of lollipops.

Date: Sat, 21 Oct 2000 12:12:51 -0400
From: w2xn@juno.com
To: qrp-l@lehigh.edu
Subject: [81722] Vertical Antennas
Message-ID: <20001021.121257.-830223.4.w2xn@juno.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

I have been reading the thread on vertical antennas and have wondered why mine works as well as it does. There is a lot of advice being given on height, radials, etc, which mine doesn't seem to follow. But mine works (I'm sure it could be better), but it works, and as long as it does, I'm not going to change it.

I live in an antenna restricted mobile home park (by the homeowners association and prospectus with the park) where I could only have a ground-mounted vertical antenna if I lived on a perimeter lot. Well as luck has it, I live on a lot right in the middle of the park..... But, it seemed that they had no objection to flagpoles. Soooooo, permission

was granted from park management and up goes a specially constructed flagpole. It's a Hustler 4-BTV vertical, groundmounted and covered with 2" thin-wall PVC pipe. Thin-wall PVC was necessary so it would slide over the traps (I had to remove the top hat). Since it had to be concealed as a flagpole, I couldn't even put it up first and do any SWR adjustments to it. I just constructed it on the carport according to the factory suggested measurements and had to slide the PVC pipe over it before putting it up.

It is mounted on a 48" pipe driven into the ground to a depth of 30", with an 8-foot ground rod directly beside it. It is fed with mini-RG-8 coax running underground to the house. There are NO radials. There is also another ground rod beside the house grounding the entrance plate where I have a connector so that I can disconnect during bad electrical storms (we have lot's of them in Florida). I also have two RF traps wound in the coax, one right at the antenna, and one right at the transceiver.

Now as to it's performance? Well at 2-1/2 watts I worked Russia. I have worked California, Oregon, Europe, Canada and Australia at 5 watts. And I have about a 98% success rate in getting the foxii of the times that I have been in fox hunts. One of the contributing factors for success, I think, is that the antenna is located about 15 feet from a small lake and we have a high enough water table for the ground rod to be below the water height.

Working QRO (yes, I do sometimes) I have success with all 50 states, Canada, Mexico, South and Central America, Greenland, Antarctic, Japan, China, Africa, Europe, Russia, Mauritius in the Indian Ocean, and others.....

I have always wondered what would happen if I put some radials on it..... But if it ain't broke, don't fix it.....

My antenna: <http://www.angelfire.com/fl4/w2xn/antenna.html>

My station: <http://www.angelfire.com/fl4/w2xn/shack.html>

Fred W2XN w2xn@arrl.net

ARRL, ARES, Skywarn #POL-007, V E

QRP: AR #233, QRP-L #1728, NJ #197, Zombie #709, FP #126

YOU'RE PAYING TOO MUCH FOR THE INTERNET!

Juno now offers FREE Internet Access!

Try it today - there's no risk! For your FREE software, visit:

<http://dl.www.juno.com/get/tagj>.

Date: Sat, 21 Oct 2000 13:01:59 -0400
From: Bruce Muscolino <w6toy@erols.com>
To: w2xn@juno.com
Cc: qrp-1@lehigh.edu
Subject: [81723] Re: Vertical Antennas
Message-ID: <39F1CC07.5C1A@erols.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Fred,

Your experience only shows that the quality of the ground in some areas is better than others. I will confidently predict that if you put down four radials for each band you use you will see a difference! I did the very exact thing you have done minus the PVC pipe. When I lived in The Netherlands I installed a HyGain 14AVT vertical in my back garden. I mounted it on a pole, driven 48 inches in the ground. I also took the trouble to drive four ground rods at the base of the antenna about 30 inches into the ground. It worked very well as a receiving antenna! However on transmit (100 watts from a TS520) it light up all the neighborhood TVs and didn't get out worth a damn! I installed 4 radials for each band, 20, 15, and 10, and it became a very good antenna!

The moral of the story? Grounds are different, even when you are living BELOW sea level!

73

Date: Sat, 21 Oct 2000 13:08:58 EDT
From: GElam30092@aol.com
To: burnleyia@home.com, qrp-1@lehigh.edu
Subject: [81724] Re: OT: Phoenix area QRP'ers
Message-ID: <dd.b221399.272327aa@aol.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

In a message dated 10/21/00 3:35:05 PM GMT Daylight Time, burnleyia@home.com writes:

<< 'll arrive on Saturday
October 28 at 7:00 am (groan) and have to leave
Thursday November 3. >>

The AZ ScQRPions meet the first Saturday of each month at a restaurant that

is just across a parking lot from HRO. We'd be insulted if you didn't come see us. :-)

Where are you staying? If it's not too far out of my way, I'll come get you for breakfast & we'll head to the meeting.

Cheers,
Gerry Elam, K7LR0
PHX AZ

Date: Sat, 21 Oct 2000 13:35:41 -0400
From: Duffer <hduff@ica.net>
To: qrp-l@lehigh.edu
Subject: [81725] More on the FT-817
Message-ID: <39F1D3ED.D68529D5@ica.net>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Be forewarned...if you can't stand the heat...carry on to the next message.

It looks like I opened up a can of controversy with my K2/FT817 post. Interesting that, for as many flame e-mails I received from K2 croonies, I got a similar amount of "hear ye" messages supporting my comments, some from prominent contributors to the qrp-l list server. Seems that *I* finally said what many have been thinking ! I'm not familiar with this but some suggested that it carried on a similar arousal to a "Zombie" controversy !?! An equal portion of e-mail that I received were from those who were neutral to any opinions but just wanted to throw their two cents worth in. However, I did get a couple of interesting messages. One stating that if I don't like the K2, I should get off the list server. Another came attached with an interesting connotation to the effect of "You've said your piece, now you should lay low"... One gets the feeling that perhaps there's a tail wagging the dog here on the qrp-l server. Hmmm...

Anyhow, I see posts quoting the ARRL technical review coming out to the rescue of the K2. (Have you ever read a particularly *BAD* review from them ?) I read it back when it was published but re-read it again to see if perhaps there was something that I just didn't 'get'. Reading nothing into the article (remaining completely objective), what I get out of it is that the author was impressed with the receiver performance of a radio that, as a kit, has some specs which are *comparable* to some of the high-end rigs. Kudos to the designers...sounds like the receiver fared well *in the lab* ! However, all other performance,

feature and operability considerations taken into account, and considering the price, it's not the radio for me. When I add up the jellybeans, simple math tells me that I could get much more for my money in a multi-band, multi-mode, DSP enhanced and physically small rice burner. The K2 is portable and runs well off of batteries so it would appeal to the backpacking crowd. (Personally, I'd take my monoband kit radio that was packaged to take the abuse of backpacking and I don't mind that it gets battered around. And it runs forever on batteries !)

As one chap put it, he buys special equipment for special applications...I just don't have a special application for a K2 or FT-817 class QRP rig.

Keep in mind kids, this is **only** MY opinion. What works for me, may not work for you.

Also, please recognize the underlying satire to which I'm attempting to bring rise to the apparent mounting resistance to a 'new kid in town'...the FT-817. Don't knock the competition...You should all be welcoming any new products to the world of QRP.

(Where's the K2 groupie net ? :)

Hugh, VA3TO

Date: Sat, 21 Oct 2000 10:49:53 -0700 (PDT)
From: ABCQRP <w6abc@yahoo.com>
To: qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU
Subject: [81726] Pacificon Photos/Swap/K1-ATU/FT-817
Message-ID: <20001021174953.1007.qmail@web2104.mail.yahoo.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

Hi,
Got a few snaps from This morning at Pacificon. See if you see anyone you know, at the swapmeet, at the vendor booth...I think I see Chuck Talking with Eric at the Elecraft Booth! Also a shot of the ATU for the K1 (got my K1 today) which will be out in a few weeks for less than \$100 according to Eric. Also 2 more pictures of the FT-817.

73/72,

Jack W6ABC

Here is the link for the photos...be patient for them to load, I didn't do thumbnails I wanted to get 'em on quickly.

<http://home.pacbell.net/friday2k/pacificon.htm>

Do You Yahoo!?
Yahoo! Messenger - Talk while you surf! It's FREE.
<http://im.yahoo.com/>

Date: Sat, 21 Oct 2000 14:28:27 EDT
From: GElam30092@aol.com
To: qrp-1@lehigh.edu
Subject: [81727] Re: FT-817 QRP Rig...
Message-ID: <5f.c0786af.27233a4b@aol.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

>There seems to be this false pretention of calling ones self a 'homebrewer'
>as kit builders in the QRP cliché. >

Well then I'm a kit-builder and happy to wear the label.

Besides, if the real TRUTH be told, the last *real* homebrewer in my family
spent time in the federal system for his homebrewing activities in the
mid-50's! :-)

Cheers,
Gerry Elam, K7LR0
PHX AZ

Date: Sat, 21 Oct 2000 14:48:39 -0400
From: "Paul Christensen" <paulc@mediaone.net>
To: <hduff@ica.net>, "Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion" <qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU>
Subject: [81728] Re: More on the FT-817
Message-ID: <019f01c03b8f\$86fc07c0\$5a668118@se.mediaone.net>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

> Anyhow, I see posts quoting the ARRL technical review coming out to the
> rescue of the K2. (Have you ever read a particularly *BAD* review
> from them ?)

Yes. For example, the ARRL's product review of the Kenwood TS-950S was a
fatal blow (See January, 1991 QST, pp. 31-35) to Kenwood's high-end product

line and the effect can still be felt today: Kenwood has not introduced a new flagship transceiver in over eight years. The product review pointed out so many inherent flaws with the '950, that demand for the product nearly stopped overnight. Those of us who owned the '950 (myself included) were very upset with the review, for it immediately devaluated the radio by nearly 50% of the purchase price. But, the review by the League's Rus Healy was 100% accurate and we all had to get over it. Kenwood's response to the product review? In less approximately six to eight months, they introduced the TS-950SDX and did nothing to console those of us with '950S owners. The TS-950SDX was and is a great transceiver, but..."once bitten, twice shy" is my motto.

Want another example? Read the product review for the Ten-Tec Argonaut II (See January, 1992 QST. pp. 77-81) for a review that is "on-topic" here. I would consider this a "particularly bad review."

The K2 offers incredible performance for its price and for the market it was intended to serve. Let's hope the FT-817 is another great radio in the same league as that of the K2. To say much of anything of the FT-817's performance is premature unless the claims are backed by independent lab evidence or "hands-on" user feedback.

-Paul, W9AC

Date: Sat, 21 Oct 2000 12:21:42 -0600
From: "Mike Newbold" <newbold@cmn.net>
To: <qrp-1@Lehigh.EDU>
Subject: [81729] Re: More on the FT-817
Message-ID: <200010211819.MAA10056@yampa.cmn.net>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

>Have you ever read a particularly *BAD* review from the ARRL???

No, I don't imagine the arrl lab would give a bad review being they take advertising money up front for the radios they advertise in Q St.

I wonder what would happen if the ARRL and Q St. were independent?

Sincerely,
Mike Newbold
K0Y0

Date: Sat, 21 Oct 2000 14:15:48 -0500
From: "Jeff Davis" <n9avg@indy.net>
To: <newbold@cmn.net>, "Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion" <qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU>
Subject: [81730] Re: More on the FT-817
Message-ID: <00e201c03b93\$52bb1ec0\$b05ab7d1@92xj301>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
 charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

QST would go broke OR we'd have 276 pages of advertisements and 4 pages of content.

72 de Jeff

----- Original Message -----

From: "Mike Newbold" <newbold@cmn.net>
To: "Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion" <qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU>
Sent: Saturday, October 21, 2000 1:21 PM
Subject: Re: More on the FT-817

> I wonder what would happen if the ARRL and Q St. were independent?

Date: Sat, 21 Oct 2000 16:45:42 -0400
From: Duffer <hduff@ica.net>
To: Paul Christensen <paulc@mediaone.net>, qrp-l@lehigh.edu
Subject: [81731] Re: More on the FT-817
Message-ID: <39F20075.3904BAB7@ica.net>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

"Bad Reviews" acknowledged but they're few and far between unless there is an unusual and predominant flaw. It takes more than a review to get my 'mojo' going. The K2 fared well by all accounts of the review. But I get a bug up my ass when I see Ford owners pissing on Chevys. Don't badmouth the competition

simply because you belong to the other camp. Sort of a communist approach to things,
don't you think ? A "my way or the highway" attitude.
That is all I'm trying to get at.
The 817 has other attractions going for it...it's small, cute, has incredible band coverage
and would make a perfect IF radio for transverters. I'm sure it will have it's niche.

Hugh

Paul Christensen wrote:

> > Anyhow, I see posts quoting the ARRL technical review coming out to the
> > rescue of the K2. (Have you ever read a particularly *BAD* review
> > from them ?)
>
> Yes. For example, the ARRL's product review of the Kenwood TS-950S was a
> fatal blow (See January, 1991 QST, pp. 31-35) to Kenwood's high-end product
> line and the effect can still be felt today: Kenwood has not introduced a
> new flagship transceiver in over eight years. The product review pointed
> out so many inherent flaws with the '950, that demand for the product nearly
> stopped overnight. Those of us who owned the '950 (myself included) were
> very upset with the review, for it immediately devaluated the radio by
> nearly 50% of the purchase price. But, the review by the League's Rus Healy
> was 100% accurate and we all had to get over it. Kenwood's response to the
> product review? In less approximately six to eight months, they introduced
> the TS-950SDX and did nothing to console those of us with '950S owners. The
> TS-950SDX was and is a great transceiver, but..."once bitten, twice shy" is
> my motto.
>
> Want another example? Read the product review for the Ten-Tec Argonaut II
> (See January, 1992 QST. pp. 77-81) for a review that is "on-topic" here. I
> would consider this a "particularly bad review."
>
> The K2 offers incredible performance for its price and for the market it was
> intended to serve. Let's hope the FT-817 is another great radio in the same
> league as that of the K2. To say much of anything of the FT-817's
> performance is premature unless the claims are backed by independent lab
> evidence or "hands-on" user feedback.
>
> -Paul, W9AC

Date: Sat, 21 Oct 2000 16:53:53 -0400
From: Bruce Muscolino <w6toy@erols.com>
To: paulc@mediaone.net
Cc: Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion <qrp-l@lehigh.edu>
Subject: [81732] Re: More on the FT-817
Message-ID: <39F20261.E32@erols.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

QRP-L gang,

Before you jump on the ARRL'S bones over it's review policies perhaps you should look into the way the reviews are done? It so happens my very best friend, now SK Bruce Williams, was Product Review manager at the League. In fact he wrote a very definitive article for QST on how products are selected, how they are tested, and what is done with equipment that does not meet its specifications.

First, ALL products selected for review are purchased by league employees from retail outlets. This eliminates the possibility of a manufacturer sending in a 'pre-prepped' unit for review. The reviewed units, warts and all are offered for auction after the review is complete. The only exception to this are kit built units that become the property of the builder! This policy was put in especially to sever any link between the advertising department and the review department! Reviews do not generate jingling of coins!

Reviews are done by league members who take the unit home and use it just like any other piece of ham equipment. Their comments are collected and used in the write up. True technical content is generated by the technical department. Guys like Ed Hare carefully measure the rig and compare it to the published specs.

Now what about the case where a unit does not measure up? There was a very popular TNC controller that was about 1/2 the price of competing units of similar design. Packet was very popular at the time so the League decided to do a review. After all if its members could save one half of the purchase price it was considered a good thing!

It didn't live up to its specs. It was a dog. The League wrote a bad review of it. The vendor did threaten to pull their advertising. Since they were running many pages each month, Bruce Williams was the person tasked with resolving the issue. I mean about 10 full pages each month, check and see who runs that much advertising!

A negotiated settlement was arranged. The manufacturer got the unit back along with the review and after a suitable period of time another

was purchased. If the vendor had fixed the problems then the league would re-review the unit. They did and they did. Happy ending, except for the addition of a provision that in the event the unit does not perform up to its specs, the unit will be returned to the manufacturer with time being given to fix or forget. If the manufacturer chooses to not fix the flaws the review doesn't run.

Now, I know you aer saying these policies are 10 years old. What if they have changed. Well, I for one, don't think they have. If they have changed then my faith in what I read has taken a beating!

73

Date: Sat, 21 Oct 2000 17:03:13 EDT
From: NM5Mike@aol.com
To: qrp-l@lehigh.edu (Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion)
Subject: [81733] FT817 vs K2
Message-ID: <51.2635512.27235e91@aol.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

I don't own a K2, and I don't plan on purchasing a Yaesu FT817. Those comparing the radios have left out an important fact regarding the new Yaesu product. It operates on amateur bands from 1.8 MHz to 432 MHz.

As a homebrewer I might be inclined someday to purchase a K1 or K2 as building either would be a fun project.

For some it might be fun to own a portable radio that could operate up to 449 MHz.

The K2 obviously works well and has an extremely loyal following. Give the new Yaesu rig a chance. A few months ago I remember a discussion on QRP-L regarding the major equipment vendors not supporting QRP enthusiasts activities. Looks like a manufacturer may have decided to provide a product that will create interest in an area of the hobby that many of us enjoy.

Eric NM5M

Date: 21 Oct 00 16:40:15 EST

From: M Goins <mgoins@usa.net>
To: qrp-1@LeHigh.EDU
Subject: [81734] new yaesu vs. K2
Message-ID: <20001021214015.13227.qmail@awcst094.netaddress.usa.net>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Seems like we're comparing apples and oranges here. =

We know the K2 is a good rig - it's proven its abilities under many different conditions. Yaesu has also built a lot of good radios over the years, and there's no reason at this point to think this is not going to possibly be one of them. =

There are two important differences here that have been mentioned repeatedly, and they're both fundamentally important. The Yaesu covers an area that the K2 does not. This may or may not be important to the end user (I personally have no use for the additional spectrum while it may be exactly what some other user needs). The other primary difference is the "build vs. buy" aspect of the K2. The guys who have built them know a great deal about what makes the K2 tick should there ever be a need for repairs or modifications. =

Apples ---oranges. =

While I doubt there will ever be a reason for me personally to opt for the new Yaesu, I do have a K2 that is now the primary radio in the station (and it sits right beside the Kenwood 440, and just below the OHR 20 meter monobander). I do not operate above 10 meters, period. Others do. that's = part of what this hobby is all about. And contrary to what seems to be being said,

owning A K2 and one fo the new Yaesus is a situation that is not mutally exclusive. Some of the folks here will undoubtably own both. =

And just for the record, I don't have any special emotional "I built it myself" attachment to my K2 (although I will after the first of the year = when I do build one). Due to my being an old guy of 51 who is back in grad school and who has almost zero free time, I bought it built from someone on this= list.

mike
wb5yjx

Get free email and a permanent address at <http://www.amexmail.com/?A=3D1>

Date: Sat, 21 Oct 2000 18:01:16 -0400
From: George Murphy <VE3ERP@ENCODE.COM>
To: qrp-l@lehigh.edu
Subject: [81735] Product Reviews
Message-ID: <4.3.2.7.0.20001021174556.00aa8a60@ENCODE.COM>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

If you trust the publication, then trust its product reviews. If reviews are biased or inaccurate, its readers will revolt. Advertisers soon cease advertising in publications with revolting readers.

Caveat Emptor.

Make up your own mind - don't buy something just because you saw a naked photograph of it in the centerfold of QST or CQ!

Date: Sat, 21 Oct 2000 17:11:36 -0500
From: "George, W5YR" <w5yr@att.net>
To: newbold@cmn.net
Cc: Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion <qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU>
Subject: [81736] Re: More on the FT-817
Message-ID: <39F21498.389FE00@att.net>

MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Yes, the Icom IC-761 has its faults forcefully exposed in the ARRL review. When the 765 came out, it was compared point for point with the 761, once again hammering on the 761 and dropping its remaining value.

I really do not see any adverse linkage between the product reports and the presence of ads in QST.

And, no, I did not fall off the turnip truck! <:}

72/73, George W5YR - the Yellow Rose of Texas NETXQRP 6

Fairview, TX 30 mi NE Dallas in Collin county QRP-L 1373
Amateur Radio W5YR, in the 55th year and it just keeps getting better!
Icom IC-756 PRO #02121 (9/00) Kachina #91900556 (12/99) IC-765 (6/90)

Mike Newbold wrote:

>
> >Have you ever read a particularly *BAD* review from the ARRL???
>
> No, I don't imagine the arrl lab would give a bad review being they take
> advertising money up front for the radios they advertise in Q St.
>
> I wonder what would happen if the ARRL and Q St. were independent?

Date: Sat, 21 Oct 2000 17:17:03 -0500
From: "George, W5YR" <w5yr@att.net>
To: k5di@zianet.com
Cc: Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion <qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU>
Subject: [81737] Re: Vertical Antennas
Message-ID: <39F215DF.66C139C3@att.net>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Karl, I have found with my HF9V, and past verticals, that you have to be very careful with S-meter comparisons with other antennas.

The S-meter can read higher simply because of the extra noise that is being picked up. I usually settle for the antenna - I have four systems here - that gives me the best copy. That usually results in the contacts that I want.

72/73, George W5YR - the Yellow Rose of Texas NETXQRP 6

Fairview, TX 30 mi NE Dallas in Collin county QRP-L 1373
Amateur Radio W5YR, in the 55th year and it just keeps getting better!
Icom IC-756 PRO #02121 (9/00) Kachina #91900556 (12/99) IC-765 (6/90)

"Karl F. Larsen" wrote:

>

> Tested it on receive of wlaw on the east coast. They start coming
> in at dark in NM and I can switch between my wire and the vertical. To my
> agony the wire seemed to work better! But after some analysis it became
> clear the signal-to-noise was better on the wire, but the signal pushed
> the s-meter higher on the vertical. Noise is vertically polarized and my
> vertical picks it up fine. Had I been working wlaw he would like the
> vertical signal much more than the wire.

Date: Sat, 21 Oct 2000 17:19:42 -0500
From: "George, W5YR" <w5yr@att.net>
To: "James R. Duffey" <jamesd1@flash.net>
Cc: Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion <qrp-l@lehigh.edu>
Subject: [81738] Re: Vertical Antennas
Message-ID: <39F2167E.B0EDDD8C@att.net>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Hope you hear the peanut whistle, Jim!

Actually, I have *four* antenna systems here and have about worn out the
coax switch with comparisons. No clear winner on all points, but the
outside 20-meter EDZ seems to have a slight edge.

72/73, George W5YR - the Yellow Rose of Texas NETXQRP 6

Fairview, TX 30 mi NE Dallas in Collin county QRP-L 1373
Amateur Radio W5YR, in the 55th year and it just keeps getting better!
Icom IC-756 PRO #02121 (9/00) Kachina #91900556 (12/99) IC-765 (6/90)

"James R. Duffey" wrote:

>

> George - Having two different antennas available is a distinct advantage:

>

> "This summer, I managed to get 16 out of the 20 Foxes - all that I could
> hear - and about half those contacts were with the Butternut HF9V and
> the other half with the 20-meter EDZ wire antenna."
>
> Particualrly when they are as dieverse as your EDZ and vertical.
>
> Several "Single Operator 2 Radio" testers use a multiband vertical as the
> antenna for the second radio.
>
> See you when it is my turn as FOX. - Dr. Megacycle KK6MC/5

Date: Sat, 21 Oct 2000 17:23:45 -0500
From: "George, W5YR" <w5yr@att.net>
To: pbuck@flash.net
Cc: Low Power Amateur Radio Discussion <qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU>
Subject: [81739] Re: ZOMBIE SHUFFLE INFO
Message-ID: <39F21771.27797745@att.net>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Tell you for a quarter . . .

Good to meet you in person today, Preston.

72/73, George W5YR - the Yellow Rose of Texas NETXQRP 6

Fairview, TX 30 mi NE Dallas in Collin county QRP-L 1373
Amateur Radio W5YR, in the 55th year and it just keeps getting better!
Icom IC-756 PRO #02121 (9/00) Kachina #91900556 (12/99) IC-765 (6/90)

Preston Buck wrote:

>
> Okay, I am dying of curiosity and can't resist.
>
> What is the plural of Elvis?
>
> Elveese, Elvii, Elvises, all y'all Elvis.
>
> It isn't in my dictionary and spell-check if of no use.
>
> 73
> Preston, n0g1m, Ellis County, TX
>
> Paul NA5N wrote:

>
> I'll post a list shortly of who the 25 Grand Zombies are. The Elvis',
> however, remain TOP SECRET until after the shuffle

Date: Sat, 21 Oct 2000 18:56:18 -0400
From: n4qa@juno.com
To: qrp-l@Lehigh.EDU
Subject: [81740] 20 & 15 were FB today
Message-ID: <20001021.185622.-86647.0.n4qa@juno.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Worked a little of the QRP contest today on 20m (1.5W) and 15m (1W) from
the mobile in the driveway with the HW-8. Worked all over the USA plus
VE2 & VE5.

Some strong sigs and some pretty weak ones but good s/n.

73-1,

Bill, N4QA

YOU'RE PAYING TOO MUCH FOR THE INTERNET!
Juno now offers FREE Internet Access!
Try it today - there's no risk! For your FREE software, visit:
<http://dl.www.juno.com/get/tagj>.

End of QRP-L Digest 1981

